IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition No.377 of 2006 (M/B)

1. Anandmani Dwivedi
   S/o Late Shri Sadanand,
   R/o Ranjhyawala, Raipur,
   Police Station Raipur,
   District Dehradun.
2. Km. Rajni @ Bhure,
   D/o Late Shri Sadanand,
   R/o Sector, IX-840, Vasilpura,
   Roop Colony, Karnal (Hariyana)
3. Jagdish Prasad
   S/o Shri Dundi Ram,
   R/o Sector IX-840, Vasilpura,
   Roop Colony, Karnal (Hariyana)
4. Smt. Urmila w/o Jagdish Prasad,
   R/o sector, IX-840, Vasilpura,
   Roop Colony, Karnal (Hariyana)
5. Vinod s/o Jagdish Prasad,
   R/o sector, IX-840, Vasilpura,
   Roop Colony, Karnal (Hariyana)
6. Smt. Yashoda
   w/o Shri Pawan Kumar,
   R/o sector, IX-840, Vasilpura,
   Roop Colony, Karnal (Hariyana) ……. Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Uttaranchal,
   through Secretary, (Home),
   Civil Secretariat,
   Uttaranchal, Dehradun.
2. Station House Officer,
   Police Station Raipur,
   District Dehradun.
3. Smt. Poonam Dwivedi
   d/o Shir Vidya Dutt Bhatt,
   r/o ½ Indira Colony,
   Chaukhuwala,
   Police Station Kotwali,
   Dehradun. …… Respondents.

……

Sri D.C. S. Rawat, Adovcate on behalf of Sri L. Dobhal, Advocate for the petitioners.
Sri H.C. Pandey, Addl. Govt. Advocate for respondents 1 and 2.
Sri Vinod Sharma for respondent no.3.

JUDGMENT

Coram: Hon'ble Rajeev Gupta, C.J.
Hon'ble Prafulla C. Pant, J.

RAJEEV GUPTA, C.J. (Oral)

Sri D.C. S. Rawat, Adovcate on behalf of Sri Lokhendra Dobhal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Sri H.C. Pandey, Addl. Govt. Advocate for respondents 1 and 2.

Sri Vinod Sharma, Advocate for respondent no.3.

2. Sri Pande, the learned Additional Government Advocate submits that the writ petition filed by the petitioners Anandmani Dwivedi Km. Rajni @ Bhure, Jagdish Prasad, Smt. Urmila, Vinod and Smt. Yashoda seeking quashing of the First Information Report and the case registered against them now has become infructuous as the police after the completion of the investigation has filed charge-sheet against the petitioners before the concerning Court.

2. In this view of matter, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

3. Consequently, the interim order dated 04.04.2006 stands vacated automatically.

(Prafulla C. Pant, J.) 05.07.2006

(Rajeev Gupta, C.J.) 05.07.2006

A